DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 126 971 JC 760 424

AUTHOR Claxton, Charles S.
TITLE Community College Staff Development: Basic Issues in Planning.
INSTITUTION Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 73p.
AVAILABLE FROM Southern Regional Education Board, 130 Sixth Street, N. W., Atlanta, Georgia 30313 ($1.00)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Education; College Faculty; Community Colleges; *Inservice Education; *Inservice Teacher Education; Job Development; *Junior Colleges; Nonprofessional Personnel; *Program Planning; *Staff Improvement

ABSTRACT

In the fall of 1975, the Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) sponsored a workshop on planning for staff development, attended by four-person teams from each of 12 two-year colleges in the South. The task of each team was to develop a plan of staff development for its institution, and, on return to the home campus, to refine the plan and begin implementation or expansion of a staff development program. Three months after the workshop, each of the 12 colleges was visited by an SREB staff person to assist the teams with their work and to identify problem areas in staff development program implementation. This discussion of issues in planning staff development programs is drawn from the experiences and concerns of the teams during the workshop, from the visits to the 12 participating colleges and to other institutions with existing programs, and from extensive conversations with persons working in staff development. The issues reviewed include administrative organization, determination of needs, appropriate program content, program promotion, funding, and steps in planning. A discussion of the workshop design is also included. (Author/DC)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED126971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Basic Issues in Planning

Charles S. Claxton

SOUTHERN REGIONAL EDUCATION BOARD
130 Sixth Street, N.W.
Atlanta, Georgia 30313
1976

$1.00

JC 760 424

FOREWORD

The image of the college campus as an accumulation of brick and mortar--instructional facilities, dormitories and football stadiums--is a partial picture of a higher educational institution. The average person, however, may not fully realize how large a part of the investment in a college or university is made up by human resources. Even educators tend to think of "instruction and departmental research" costs--some 65 percent of educational and general expenditures--as the total staffing component of the college operation. Actually, the share of educational and general expenditures devoted to salaries and wages for all institutional functions adds up to about 80 percent of the total. This includes administrative, library, plant maintenance and other personnel.

Staff resources have always comprised the lion's share of educational operational expenditures, but concern to apply those resources for the greatest level of effectiveness is much stronger today than ever before. For one thing, the pressures for institutional accountability continue to mount from the public and from other sources of support. Also, with stabilization in staff composition at the individual institutions--as opposed to the greater faculty mobility which characterized the 1960's--institutions are much more motivated in taking pains to assure that staff effectively carry out the functions for which they are hired. Faculty development offices, variously titled, have been offered as a mechanism for helping in the accomplishment of this objective.

Community colleges have their own pattern of staff recruitment, their own definition of institutional identity within the community, and their own objectives in staff development. An SREB workshop which addressed itself to some of these issues on October 29-November 1, 1975 reflects the growing interest among these institutions to foster a pattern of staff development that is particularly fitted to their needs. It is hoped that the experience of the group which met at that time in Atlanta can be a resource to others among the 368 two-year institutions in the South.

Winfred L. Godwin
President

PREFACE

One of the most pressing needs in the field of community college education today is staff development. A critical factor in the establishment of an effective staff development program--and one that has thus far received very little attention--is sound planning.

In the fall of 1975, the Southern Regional Education Board sponsored a workshop on planning for staff development, attended by four-person teams from each of 12 two-year colleges in the South. The task of each team was to develop a plan of staff development for its institution. The idea was that the teams would return to their home campuses, continue working on their plans and begin implementation or expansion of their staff development programs.

Three months after the workshop, each of the 12 colleges was visited by an SREB staff person to assist the teams with their work and to identify problem areas in implementing the staff development plans. This report is a discussion of some of the basic issues in planning with which the colleges were dealing. While the institutions are not necessarily representative of all two-year colleges in the South or in the nation, the issues and problems they were facing are essentially those with which other institutions will deal in the creation and implementation of staff development plans. This discussion of basic issues, then, should be helpful to persons in community and junior colleges who are charged with planning for staff development.

Charles S. Claxton
Staff Associate

Table of Contents

	Page
Foreword	1
Preface	111
Section I -- INTRODUCTION TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT	1
Forces for Change	3
Staff Development for Whom?	9
Preservice Education	12
Response to the Demand for Staff Development	14
An SREB Staff Development Workshop	15
Section II -- ISSUES IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT	21
Organizing for Staff Development	22
Components of Staff Development	25
Comprehensive Staff Development	33
Needs Assessment	37
Institutional and Personal Goals	40
Staff Development and Evaluation of Staff	41
A Voluntary Program?	42
Section III -- ASPECTS OF THE PLANNING PROCESS	46
Early Steps in Establishing a Staff Development Program	46
Funding of Staff Development Programs	49
Suggested Steps in Planning	53
A Concluding Word	56
References	59
Workshop Agenda	61
Roster of Participants	64

Section I

INTRODUCTION TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT

Throughout the history of the United States, the demands on institutions of higher education have been great. But as broad as the missions of traditional senior colleges and universities have been, it may be no exaggeration to say that the most difficult demands have been placed on community and junior colleges. These institutions have proclaimed their mission to be extremely broad in scope, including the familiar litany of university parallel programs, career curricula, short-term training, continuing education, community service, compensatory education, and guidance and counseling. All of these programs were to meet the educational needs of an extremely diverse clientele whose ability levels ranged from the well prepared to those who had had little, if any, success in their previous educational endeavors.*

For an institution that had accepted such a monumental task, it is surprising how little attention has been given to the preparation and development of its staff. Most community college faculty and staff come from one of three disparate areas: colleges and secondary schools, graduate departments in universities, and business and industry. Gradually, as

---

*A draft of this paper was reviewed by Dr. Frederick W. Atherton, Statewide Coordinator, Staff and Program Development, Florida Division of Community Colleges, Tallahassee, Florida, and Ms. Christina Z. Rojahn, Special Assistant to the President, Catonsville Community College, Catonsville, Maryland. The author wishes to acknowledge the valuable suggestions each made, but bears full responsibility for the opinions expressed.

community colleges expanded rapidly in the 1950's and 1960's, a number of graduate schools began offering courses in "the community college," and an increasing number of staff in the two-year institutions have had at least an introduction to the community college movement through this route.

Meanwhile, the in-service education that did occur usually consisted of faculty attendance at conferences, an occasional sabbatical, and the familiar one- or two-day workshop at the beginning of the fall term. Often, most of the fall workshops were devoted to procedural matters, such as attendance records and grading policies, rather than to substantive staff development. Occasionally, an "inspirational" speaker was brought in to address the faculty.

One reason for the lack of action in staff development was the fact that, with enrollment increases straining the capacity of the institutions to accommodate the steady flow of students, educators did not see it as a high priority, and it was assumed that new ideas and new teaching techniques would come about through the regular influx of new staff who joined the ranks each year.

This was always a rather dubious assumption. New faculty fresh out of graduate schools generally were trained in traditional disciplines, and had been exposed to traditional teaching approaches. Most had little or no introduction to the community college as such. Once there, they were the novices of the staff and, thus, had little impact in influencing the institution.

But staff development in recent years has begun to come to the forefront of attention in community colleges and, with the change in emphasis,

has come a new view. Whereas staff development used to refer to such practices as providing sabbatical leaves for faculty or providing travel money for them to attend national conferences, the term now generally refers to an entire range of activities from sabbatical leave, to learning non-traditional teaching techniques, to personal growth workshops. This new emphasis on staff development comes about because of several significant forces impinging on the two-year institutions.

Forces for Change

Decreased Faculty Mobility

The first and most obvious force is that, with budgets that are no longer rapidly expanding and with stabilizing enrollments, there are fewer new faculty each year. Faculty mobility, so long a characteristic of higher education, has now diminished. Because faculty members tend to remain at their institutions, there is an increasing realization that the college should help them to develop further their competencies in working with students.

Lack of Success with Poorly Prepared Students

Community college educators have begun to realize that what their institutions delivered did not always equal what was promised. By adopting an open admissions policy, community colleges seem to be saying that they could meet the demands of all students--those who came well prepared for college work as well as those whose entire educational background was characterized by failure. In terms of meeting the needs of the well prepared

students, the community colleges have done very well. But the record of meeting the needs of the more poorly prepared students is uneven.

For one thing, attrition rates, while high in all of postsecondary education, are particularly high in community colleges. Monroe (1972, p. 208) estimates that for larger community colleges only 30 to 50 percent of the students return after the first year. While some recent studies document the fact that many students are "stopping out" for good reasons, rather than dropping out because of failure, the fact remains that many students who enter the community college each year are not able to use it effectively as a means of achieving their objectives.

Also related to attrition are the college programs labeled "compensatory" or "developmental." The idea has been that students who had inadequate preparation and were not ready to do college-level work could increase their skills in the compensatory programs. This, too, is a rather audacious objective on the part of the community college. The students in these programs were usually those who had done poorly all the way through the public school system, and yet community colleges proposed to develop their academic skills sufficiently to do college work within one or two semesters. While some programs have been successful, in general the compensatory programs have not been effective enough to remedy the deficiencies of the marginal students.

Changing Clientele

The clientele of the community college continues to change rapidly, much more so than is generally realized. A striking change in recent years

is the tremendous increase in part-time students.

Harcleroad (1975) reports that in 750 two-year institutions in one national study, part-time students make up no less than 52% of the total enrollment. Drawing on an informal study of his own and using additional data, Harcleroad concluded the following:

1. An increase in enrollment of more mature students, particularly in the 25-55 age bracket and persons over age 55.
2. An increased interest in vocational programs.
3. Increased enrollment of females.
4. Possibly an increasing number of "reverse transfers," i.e., students transferring from senior institutions to community junior colleges. In North Carolina, for example, 1,500 students transferred from two-year colleges to four-year schools. But in the same year (1973-74), 1,300 transferred from the senior institutions to community colleges.
5. A large number of students with baccalaureate degrees enrolling in two-year colleges, often in occupational programs.
6. Some indication that more students are attending college in an "in-and-out" fashion, rather than in continuous attendance.
7. An increased number of students requiring financial assistance.
8. A high percentage of students (31 percent) who are from minority groups.

Thus, it can be seen that staff members who received their training even five to seven years ago are now dealing with a student body having quite different characteristics.

New Teaching Technologies

Another of the important forces for change in the community college is an increasing realization that traditional means of teaching and the

traditional college structure will not meet the needs of students of the community college. "Teaching" has traditionally referred to the interaction between the teacher and the student in the classroom on the college campus. But now that interaction may go on in places all over the college district. For example, Florida Junior College at Jacksonville conducts classes not only on its formal campuses but in some 300 other locations, including nursing homes, public schools, bank buildings and hospitals. Further, students may learn, not only from a teacher giving a lecture before the class, but also by using multi-media learning materials in the learning resources center through a variety of experiences that may or may not be coordinated by the teacher. More and more faculty members find themselves moving into the use of a full range of teaching techniques, including mastery learning, independent study, cooperative education and others.

Changing Context

Finally, there is the changing context within which the community college operates. The forces at work here are not entirely clear and the trends are not without some ambiguity. For one thing, it is estimated that more than 80 million adults are now engaged in formal learning activities outside traditional educational institutions, such as in training programs operated by business and industry, correspondence schools, educational programs in the military, and avocational programs of churches and neighborhood centers. A number of corporations have full fledged and very sophisticated training programs for their employees. The state of Massachusetts has authorized the Arthur D. Little Company to award the Master of Business

Administration degree (Bender, 1975, p. 25). Students enrolled in proprietary schools may now be eligible to receive money through federal student aid programs, and proprietary schools are being considered for regional accreditation. Hence, "education" is less and less the exclusive province of traditional educational institutions.

Further, a trend that is affecting the mission of the community junior college is the increasing demand for persons to be able to demonstrate competence, rather than just to show educational credentials. A 1971 court case is being seen as having direct implication for competency based learning. In Griggs vs. Duke Power Company (401 U.S. 424, 1971), a case which concerned tests used for selection from a pool of applicants, the court stated, "What Congress has forbidden is giving these devices and mechanisms controlling force unless they are demonstrable or reasonable measures of job performance." The situation was one where persons brought suit because they were disqualified for jobs by virtue of their not having a high school diploma. But the company could not prove that the high school diploma in fact represented the skills required on the job. The significance here is that many companies say a person must have a certain credential, e.g., a high school diploma, to get a particular job. But the high school diploma may mean only that the person has made it through the twelfth grade; he still may not have certain basic skills. Employers may begin to look to educational institutions to certify that the student has certain competencies, not just that he has accumulated a specified number of semester hour credits.

If this trend continues, it may be that postsecondary education institutions will have to stop dealing in the currency of grades and semester hours and, instead, to develop ways to certify competence of the people who come to the college. Such a change will have a profound impact on the community college and will dictate a radical restructuring of the role of the staff of the institution.

All of these forces for change--decreased faculty mobility, the increasing awareness of the community college's notable lack of success in serving the students who come poorly prepared, the change in the college's clientele, the increasing use of non-traditional teaching technologies, the realization that colleges are only one place, among many, where people may further their education, and the societal demands for schools to assess competence--are having, and will continue to have, enormous impact on the people who carry out the work of the community college.

How shall colleges respond? Can they rely on the preservice preparation of their staff to equip them to deal effectively with the changes? Can staff development continue to consist of a few activities, such as new faculty orientation and an occasional sabbatical in which a teacher can get a few more graduate credit hours? The answer seems self-evident. What is needed is a comprehensive approach to staff development in which the personal and professional growth of each staff person is a central, rather than ancillary, activity of the community college. In this way the college may hope to meet the educational needs of its students.

Staff Development for Whom?

There are varying views as to what group on the campus should be included in staff development programs. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) uses the term "staff" to mean "all those who in their varied capacities help to create and maintain an environment in which our students...can learn what they need to know to increase their skills and to manage their lives more effectively" (Yarrington, 1974, pp. 138-139). As such, AACJC believes programs should be designed for "faculty, administrators, support personnel, trustees, students, personnel in state agencies responsible for community college administration, and, where appropriate, members of the community" (Yarrington, 1974, p. 147).

Collins (1974, p. 55) has commented, "It is difficult to write about staff development without implying that present staff members are a dismal collection of failures." It may well be that when there is talk of staff development, particularly the kind that is imposed from above, the reaction is either one of defensiveness ("I don't need 'developing'") or detachment ("I expect my office-mate could use it!"). But the increasing number of adults and older persons in the classroom demonstrates that the need and desire for personal and career growth are very real, and college staff members are affected by this.

With the inadequacy of preservice programs and the increasingly difficult demands made on teachers, there is little argument about the need for continuing development for teachers. The same is probably true for student services staff, particularly where they function as an integral

part of the educational team. There may be less agreement, however, about including members other than faculty in the staff development programs.

Administrators

The college's administrative leadership is often omitted from a program, particularly when the members of that group design the program for the rest of the staff. But, if staff development is based on the premise that all staff members are a part of the organization and need to continue to grow, then it logically follows that an effective program will include administrative personnel.

The need for such development is underscored by Petty (1974, p. 16), who states that programs to groom persons for leadership positions in community colleges are "virtually nonexistent." He describes the "instant administrator" phenomenon where "today's dean of students becomes tomorrow's dean of instruction, and by next summer, the college president." Petty states that the turnover rate for administrators is as high as 50 percent in a three-year time period in some community colleges and, thus, the establishment of such training programs is long overdue.

Whether management occurs in an industry or a college or university, one of the most pressing needs with regard to the development of management personnel is the ability to work with people to facilitate broad participation in decision-making. Two-year colleges, more than senior colleges and universities, are characterized by the traditional model of organization where power is vested primarily in the top levels (the trustees and administration) and much less so in the other levels (faculty and students).

This hierarchic model, as business and industry have been finding, is increasingly inappropriate. Alternative models of administration and governance, with greater emphasis on broad participation by the various groups in the college community, are being discussed and adopted (Richardson, et al., 1972). An effective staff development program can be instrumental in bringing this about.

Classified Staff

With reference to the classified staff, one writer tells of an incident in which the college president's secretary was telling townspeople, "Of course, we will become a four-year institution just as soon as possible," totally unaware that a two-year institution could have a distinct mission of its own (Barthlow, 1973, p. 34). This points up the fact that while the professional staff may be fully steeped in the philosophy of the community colleges, it does not necessarily follow that the support staff understands it.

Further, there is a tendency to overlook the dynamics of informal influence that members of the support staff have with students. Frequently, a student with a question or problem will go to a member of the support staff, rather than to a counselor or teacher with whom he cannot identify. The support staff member needs to know enough about the college and its purpose and services either to answer the question directly or to refer the student to the appropriate staff member. A staff development program which includes support staff can help bring this about and, thereby, have a beneficial impact on the college as a whole.

Preservice Education

Does the present emphasis on in-service development of staff mean that no attention should be given to preservice education? No, and, in fact, an examination of preservice education is an important ingredient in planning for staff development.

Certainly the dissatisfaction among community college educators with the preservice programs which graduate schools provide to persons who later teach in two-year colleges is one of the major reasons for the present concern with in-service development. O'Banion (1974, p. 28) voices the opinion of many community college leaders when he characterizes preservice programs for community college faculty as "grossly inadequate." A major concern is that graduate programs concentrate first on helping their students develop competence in research and only secondarily on skills in teaching.

The assumption in the past has been that if the person is trained in a discipline and has specialized knowledge in it, he will have all the preparation necessary to be a good teacher. But primarily because of the different kind of student body that is in college today, the skills needed for successful teaching are quite different from those required in the past. The community college teacher must be well versed in knowledge beyond the discipline: learning theory, use of instructional technology, affective learning, testing, competency assessment, group dynamics, just to name a few.

Fortunately, there have been some recent developments which portend well for improved preparation of community college staff. In the fall of 1974 the National Board on Graduate Education brought together representatives of graduate schools and community colleges to discuss the problems of preservice education for community college faculty. David Brenneman, the Board's staff director, states that the group "hopes the report may stimulate graduate schools to work more closely with neighboring community colleges" (Semas, 1975, p. 3).

O'Banion (1975, pp. 48-62), speaking at that conference, reported on several programs that were designed to meet more adequately the preservice needs of the community colleges: the Junior College Leadership Program, funded by the W. K. Kellogg Foundation, in which eleven major universities have offered programs since 1969 to train leadership for the two-year college; establishment of non-traditional graduate programs in which many of the enrollees are community college personnel, such as Nova University in Fort Lauderdale, Florida, the Union Graduate School, created by the Union for Experimenting Colleges and Universities at Yellow Springs, Ohio, and the Humanistic Psychology Institute in San Francisco. Also, there is an increasing number of cooperative arrangements between community colleges and neighboring universities. For example, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University has a cooperative arrangement with nearby New River Community College in which members participate in courses and workshops given by the University on the New River Community College campus.

While it is encouraging to see these kinds of responses to preservice needs, the fact remains that the in-service needs of staff are great. An

appropriate point of departure in planning the staff development program is to examine what is going on (or not going on) in the preservice preparation of staff.

Response to the Demand for Staff Development

There have been numerous responses to the demand for expanded staff development activities. The Community College Act, which was passed as part of the Education Amendments of 1972, called for statewide planning for development. In Florida two percent of the instructional budget is provided for staff and program development. The National Training Laboratory at Bethel, Maine, has initiated a staff development program for community college personnel. The American Association of Community and Junior Colleges has called attention to the need for improved staff development through research and publications. The theme of the 1973 National Assembly of AACJC was staff development, and from that body's deliberations came the very useful document, Educational Opportunities for All: New Staff for New Students, edited by Roger Yarrington.

At the institutional level, a number of colleges have established comprehensive and continuous staff development programs. But this still remains the exception rather than the rule. In early 1975 the Research Unit of the Southern Regional Education Board conducted a wide-ranging study of faculty evaluation in the colleges and universities of the South (Boyd and Schietinger, 1976). In reviewing the data it was noted that two-year colleges in particular stated that faculty development was one of the primary reasons for evaluation. Yet, only a few colleges appeared to be carrying out

comprehensive staff development activities.

There are at least two reasons why few colleges have full-fledged programs. The first is that they feel they do not have the money. Secondly, the colleges feel they do not have the skills and experience needed to plan, organize and implement an effective staff development program.

There is no question that staff development costs money, but it is often not as expensive as some colleges fear. While some colleges have established offices of staff development with professional personnel to direct a wide array of activities, many other colleges operate comprehensive programs through faculty and staff committees. Further, colleges generally have some funds set aside in the budget for faculty sabbaticals, travel, etc., and these funds usually can be "packaged" in such a way as to form the basis of funding a more comprehensive staff development program.

In reality, the most serious obstacle to the establishment of an effective staff development program may be the lack of expertise and experience in knowing how to go about planning and organizing such a program.

An SREB Staff Development Workshop

Because it was felt that many community colleges were seeking assistance in planning staff development programs, the Research Unit of the Southern Regional Education Board decided in late 1975 to sponsor a staff development workshop for community colleges with emphasis on program planning. The Research staff, with assistance from the staff of SREB's Project on Undergraduate Education Reform, began preparations for the workshop by drawing upon the advice and suggestions of an *ad hoc* committee made up of persons

active in staff development in the SREB region. The committee included:

Dr. Ray Hawkins
Dean of Instruction
Tarrant County Junior College (Northeast Campus), Texas
(Formerly Director, Community College Programs of the
Texas Coordinating Board)

Dr. Al P. Mizell
Associate Dean for Instructional Development
Howard Community College, Maryland

Dr. Carol Zion
Director of Staff and Organization Development
Miami-Dade Community College (North Campus), Florida

Because it appeared that the need for assistance in planning was such a vital one, it was decided that the focus of the workshop should be for the participants from each college to develop a plan, or at least a basic outline of a plan, for staff development for their college. In this way the workshop would be action- and task-oriented, with the respective staff development plans as the concrete outcome of the workshop.

Once it was decided that the design of plans was the basic purpose of the workshop, several other ideas guided the planning:

Commitment. The colleges that would benefit most from participating would be those that were truly committed to moving ahead with staff development for their institutions. In most cases they would already be engaged in some staff development activities but would profit from going through a process of refining and expanding their activity. Hence, the formulation of a staff development plan would be a worthwhile and appropriate venture for them.

Team approach. Because a successful development program depends on the involvement of the entire staff, the workshop should be designed for college teams, rather than for just one or two representatives from each college. The college team members could become the nucleus of leadership for organizing the staff development effort and winning the commitment of the entire staff on the home campus. It was decided that the team should probably be made up of the head of the college's instructional program, the person charged with staff development (or the chairperson of the college's staff development committee if there was such a person), and two other professional staff members.

Small number of colleges. To assure intensive involvement of the participants in the workshop activities, it was decided that no more than ten to twelve colleges would be asked to participate.

Cost sharing. The workshop should be a cost-sharing venture on the part of SREB and the participating colleges. SREB would pay the costs of the meeting itself--consultants' fees and expenses, materials, etc. Each college would pay for the travel, room and board expenses of its four team members.

Follow-up visit. Because each team would be committed to begin implementing the plan it had developed at the workshop, it was felt useful to have a follow-up visit to each college several weeks after the workshop to offer assistance as the teams worked on their staff development activities. The follow-up visit would be considered an integral part of the workshop and would be made at

no expense to the institution.

Selecting the Colleges

Through suggestions from the planning committee and from persons throughout the region who were acquainted with community college activities in staff development, the SREB staff began contacting colleges that seemed to fit the criteria that had been outlined. In so doing the staff found that institutions were already conducting some staff development activities and felt a need for some assistance in bringing their activities to full fruition.

The colleges that participated were:

Amarillo College, Amarillo, Texas
Brunswick Junior College, Brunswick, Georgia
Delgado College, New Orleans, Louisiana
Elizabethtown Community College, Elizabethtown, Kentucky
Essex Community College, Baltimore County, Maryland
Guilford Technical Institute, Jamestown, North Carolina
John Tyler Community College, Chester, Virginia
Paris Junior College, Paris, Texas
Parkersburg Community College, Parkersburg, West Virginia
Seminole Community College, Sanford, Florida
Shelby State Community College, Memphis, Tennessee
Westark Community College, Fort Smith, Arkansas

An Overview of Workshop Activities

Prior to the workshop, the participants were sent a background paper on staff development in community colleges. When the teams arrived at the workshop, each was given a resource notebook--a collection of articles and other materials dealing with staff development--which the SREB staff had compiled.

The workshop opened with a presentation of adult development, a topic which provided a broad context for later discussions of staff development.

The first full day of the workshop began with an overview presentation on staff development. Next, Dr. Carol Zion directed a series of action-oriented activities to help the participants develop further their skills in information sharing, group interaction, consensus building, conflict resolution, and identification of needs and objectives for staff development programs.

A presentation was made on the planning process. This was followed by the teams beginning to work on their own staff development plans. Four resource persons--Dr. Ray Hawkins, Dr. Al P. Mizell, Dr. Ned Moomaw, Associate Director for SREB's Project on Undergraduate Education Reform, and Ms. Christina Rojahn, Special Assistant to the President for Staff Development, Catonsville Community College, Maryland--were assigned to work with three teams each. Each resource person worked with their teams on an "as need" basis.

The teams continued working on their plans throughout the workshop but were together as a group for two "showcase" demonstrations, as representatives from two colleges described the staff development activities at their institutions.

On the last day of the workshop the twelve teams participated in a final, "wrap-up" session. Each team described the plan for staff development which it had developed during the workshop, and the panel of resource persons gave its reactions to the plans.

At the conclusion of the workshop each team left a copy of its staff development plan with the SREB staff. It was announced that the follow-up visit would take place three months after the workshop.

Section II

ISSUES IN STAFF DEVELOPMENT

During the course of the workshop, the participants discussed at length the many issues related to staff development. They heard presentations by consultants, interacted with team members from other colleges and the workshop resource persons, and worked on the staff development plans for their own colleges. Once they returned home, the team members took steps to develop further the plans they had outlined and to begin implementing or expanding their programs.

At the same time the SREB staff began analyzing and discussing the issues raised during the workshop, reviewing further the literature on staff development, and talking at length with persons in community colleges who were directing staff development programs. In February and March, 1976 each of the twelve colleges was visited by an SREB staff member. The follow-up visit was an occasion for the team members to assess their progress, to discuss in greater depth the issues raised during the workshop, and to pinpoint problem areas.

The following discussion of issues in planning staff development is drawn from the experiences and concerns of the teams during the workshop, from the visits to the twelve participating colleges as well as to other institutions with staff development programs, and from extensive conversations with persons working in staff development. While the colleges are not considered fully representative of the two-year colleges in the SREB region, the issues and concerns they have been dealing with are much the same

as those other community colleges will face as they plan their staff development programs.

Organizing for Staff Development

There are certain underlying principles that should form the foundation of any staff development program. Dr. Zion stated during the workshop that whenever there is a call for the establishment of a staff development program, many people interpret this to mean that there are deficiencies among the staff which need correcting. What is, in fact, needed is a redefinition of the term so that it means growth of individuals, rather than the remedying of deficiencies. With this as a starting principle, several guidelines emerge as to what staff development is and is not:

1. Staff development is not "for someone else." Rather, it is for everyone on the staff--faculty, administrators, student services staff, support staff, custodial personnel, secretarial staff and security officers.

2. Staff development is not something isolated from the other activities of the organization. It is a continuous, interactive process that encompasses the entire institution and all its people.

3. Staff development is not a pre-packaged program brought in from the outside and imposed on the institution. Rather, the staff looks at what is needed for this particular community college and the design of the program flows from that analysis.

4. A staff development program is not a haphazard use of resources. It is a planned resource allocation which is consistent with the goals of the institution.

5. Staff development is not a "bag of tricks." Instead, it is a context for selecting ways to achieve individual and institutional goals and a means by which they can be achieved.

Colleges are using several approaches to organize staff development programs. One is the establishment of an office of staff development with a full-time director, usually with a representative committee to advise the staff development officer. This approach has the advantage of providing high visibility for staff development, of demonstrating administrative commitment, and, especially, of having a full-time person whose specific concerns, energy and attention are devoted to staff development.

A disadvantage, obviously, is that it costs money to maintain such an office, particularly at a time when many colleges are having to reduce expenditures. Further, it may tend to centralize the responsibility into an office in such a way that other people may assume an attitude of indifference. This is a serious concern, since the effectiveness of staff development is dependent upon broad-based support and involvement.

There are reservations, too, among some people about adding another person to the staff whose duties are not primarily teaching. One president, for example, has commented on the trend for more and more members of a college staff to have positions other than in the teaching area, even though teaching is supposedly the central role of the college. For this reason, he said, he prefers not to have a full-time staff development person.

A second approach is to have a committee, made up of representatives of the various segments of the college, to be responsible for staff development. This has the advantage of being less expensive than having an office of staff development, and it can ensure broad participation from the staff.

On the other hand, there is a great deal of "legwork" that must be done to implement the decisions of the committee, and this process is very difficult for a committee. A way to overcome this problem is to provide released time at least for the committee chairman who can then carry out the major work of the committee.

A third approach is to combine staff development with other responsibilities and assign them to a person already on the staff. This combining of offices may well be an appropriate approach, particularly in a college that feels it needs someone in two areas but is unable to afford two full-time staff positions. The drawback, of course, is that the two jobs may add up to more than one person can handle effectively.

What about making staff development the responsibility of the dean of instruction or other line officer? This is the way it has been done in the past, and it is not as expensive as hiring an additional staff person. But there are some serious drawbacks in organizing staff development this way. During the workshop Dr. Zion emphasized very strongly her feeling that a line administrator cannot be the staff development officer. A line officer is responsible for, among other things, hiring and firing and, as such, he cannot effectively serve as the person charged with staff development. People must feel they can be open with the staff development officer and be able to identify their own weaknesses and desire for growth. If the person with whom they are sharing these concerns is also the one who can discharge them, this openness and honesty may not come.

Because the staff development needs vary so greatly from one institution to another, it is impossible to say just what approach a college should take

in organizing its program. But there are two guidelines that seem applicable to any program. First, ways have to be provided for broad-based support and involvement in the planning and implementation of the program. A useful technique is to have a staff development committee made up of representatives from all segments of the college's staff.

Second, there needs to be one person who is responsible for the program and who will have the time to ensure that the many tasks related to the program are accomplished. A committee can advise, suggest, react, and set the direction and tone of a program but, in the final analysis, one person has to be responsible for seeing that things get done, for maintaining momentum, and for continually being concerned about staff development at the college. Having a full-time staff development officer is certainly an advantageous approach. If this is not practical, perhaps a person can be freed to devote at least a portion of his time to coordinating the staff development activity. It is almost impossible for a committee to be responsible for planning and implementing a program when no one in the group has at least some released time to devote to the work.

Components of Staff Development

Staff or faculty development generally has focused on instructional improvements only. But Gaff (1975) has described a very helpful model for staff development in which there are three components: faculty development, instructional development, and organizational development. Faculty development is designed to assist faculty members in personal and professional growth, and activities are designed to help teachers learn new skills and knowledge relating to the teaching function. Instructional development focuses on the

curricula and ways to improve student learning through the re-designing of courses and the preparation of more effective learning materials. Organizational development focuses on the environment or atmosphere of the institution itself and seeks ways to create a more effective setting in which development can occur.

Bergquist and Phillips (1975) have set forth a similar model of staff development which includes instructional development, organizational development, and personal development.

In this model, instructional development includes:

1. Instructional evaluation (including self-evaluation, peer evaluation, and student evaluation)
2. Instructional diagnosis (including contracting, data collection, and data feedback)
3. Microteaching
4. Educational methodology and technology
5. Curricular development

Organizational development is concerned with the structure and environment (i.e., the climate) of the institution and includes:

1. Departmental decision-making and conflict management
2. Departmental team building
3. Management building

Personal development includes:

1. Faculty interviews
2. Life planning workshops
3. Interpersonal skill training
4. Personal growth workshops

5. Supportive and theraputic counseling

Staff members are generally familiar with instructional development and this needs no further elaboration here. There is less understanding, however, of organizational and personal development.

Organizational development is a much discussed topic in business and industry and was highlighted in a classic paper, "Breakthrough in Organizational Development" in the Harvard Business Review (Blake, et al., 1964). The essential point of organizational development is that the development of individuals and programs within an organization cannot really be successful unless the organization itself is also developing. If this does not occur, the development of individual members of the staff cannot occur because there is no receptivity to change in the environment.

Development generally means change; only where change is accepted and encouraged can staff development be meaningful. Hence, in planning for college staff development, adequate attention must be given to the atmosphere and structure of the organization.

The climate of an organization is something that is not concrete or easily seen and, perhaps for that reason, planners in staff development often overlook it. What so many planners do is "rush in" and begin to conduct activities in staff development. But actually that should come later, at its proper time. The place to start is with assessment of the organizational climate.

Dr. Zion led a discussion on the "health of an organization." She noted that in unhealthy organizations, staff members, other than the few at the top levels, have little personal investment in the objectives of the

organization; all important decisions are made by just a few people; competition, rather than collaboration, is the common pattern; and the personal needs and feelings of staff members are regarded as irrelevant. On the other hand, in healthy organizations the objectives are shared by persons at all levels; where decisions are made is determined by such factors as staff members' ability rather than solely their level in the organization; collaboration is a common pattern; and the concerns addressed by the organization include staff members' personal needs and interpersonal relationships.

Using this kind of perspective to view the organization, staff members can get some sense of where their institution is along the dimension of organizational health. Effective staff development will thrive when change, openness and trust are present. Where this is not the case, the staff needs to discuss the problem and take steps to improve the climate. This is a first step, as well as a continuing process, for those who plan, implement and participate in staff development.

Personal development is based upon the premise that what a person does, as a teacher or administrator or whatever, depends essentially on "where he is as a person." Humanistic psychologists such as Maslow, Rogers, and others state that a person is continually evolving as ("becoming") a person. This process can be facilitated by an appropriate organizational environment and activities which contribute to the individual's growth as a person. In turn, the college gains because people develop in their jobs as they develop as persons.

Because people are not used to thinking of staff development as a means of personal development, they may need assistance in identifying personal goals and objectives. It is helpful if staff members are encouraged to go through a process of introspection and reflection upon their personal lives, their careers, and their goals in life. Such a process can be facilitated by having staff members become familiar with significant research in the area of adult development.

Stages of Adult Development

Behavioral scientists concerned with human development have traditionally focused only on youth, and very little research has been conducted on how adults develop. There seems to be an assumption that once people become adults, they enter a stable, even static period in which little significant change occurs. Recently, Levineson (1974) and others have carried out some interesting research which indicates the kind of challenges, crises and changes adults experience as they progress through life. (It should be pointed out that most of the research on adult development is on males only, and the findings should be examined with that limitation in mind. Hopefully, research which includes females will be carried out in the near future.)

Levineson has identified five adult developmental stages. He calls the first one, "Leaving the Family," and this usually occurs between ages 16 to 18 and 20 to 24. The person has completed or dropped out of high school by that time, and is partly independent but still very much a part of his family and dependent to some extent on the family members. For many persons there are intermediate institutions, such as college or the military,

which facilitate the transition in leaving the family. The stage ends when the balance shifts and the person is more on his own than in the family.

The second stage is called "Getting Into the Adult World" and occurs between the early 20's and 27 to 29. Here the person explores the possibilities that are available to him in the adult world. He gets into his chosen work and, in the late part of this period, he is considering whether he wishes to make a deeper commitment to that vocation or whether to change fields while there is still time. Marriage and the beginning of a family may come during this period.

The next stage, "Settling Down," usually occurs between age 30 to 38 and is one in which the person finds his place in the organization in which he works and begins to develop some sense of autonomy and importance. Ambiguity and sometimes conflict are present in this period because it may be a time of "moving up" at the same time that he is settling into a career. Opportunities for promotion which require him to move geographically often present themselves. Stress is often present, including strain in the marital relationship. The divorce rate is high during this period.

During the latter part of this period (from age 35 to 39) there is the stage of "Becoming One's Own Man." The person has become restive and constrained by those under whom he works. He comes to feel, more and more, that he wants to be "his own man" and that he is capable of doing so. He frequently focuses on a key advancement, such as becoming vice-president of the company, a full professor, or the foreman.

The next phase, "Mid-life Transition," occurs between the ages of 39 and 43 and is, for many people, an extremely difficult period. Hodgkinson

(1974) notes that for the first time the person realizes he is no longer "growing up" but is instead "growing old." He sees that his life is finite, after all. There is usually some preoccupation with fantasies of "what if"--What if I had pursued a different career? Or gone to a different college? Or married a different person? The phrase "middlescence" is used to describe this period as the person goes through a crisis of introspection which is not unlike that of adolescence. On the other hand, the people who get through this period successfully often move into a period of outstanding success and achievement.

During this period there is usually a re-appraisal of the dreams the person had in his twenties, as he realizes his own mortality and sees that he must adjust his dreams in light of reality. For those who have achieved the objectives they had set, there is often disappointment in the lack of satisfaction the achievements have brought, followed by the development of a new set of goals.

Levineson's research stops with the onset of middle adulthood, but Hodgkinson (1974), Gould (1972), Sheehy (1974) and others have described the later stages.

The period between the ages of 43 and 50 is called "Re-stabilization and Flowering" and it is frequently the most rewarding part of a person's life. He has clarified his goals, based upon a realistic view of his life, and he has eliminated regrets over past failures and missed opportunities. Personal relationships take on a new richness, and there is an invigoration of marriage. Often the person adopts new interests and activities which he finds rewarding.

The last stage, "Mellowing," occurs in the "50 plus" years. There is usually a decrease in physical fitness and energy. The spouse and other family members are increasingly important. The person spends some time reviewing his contributions to his family, and, perhaps, his community. For some persons there is a sense of great attainment as they seem to move into their greatest period of creativity, insight and ability.

It can be seen from this brief sketch that adult development has many implications for staff development.* Perhaps it needs to be stated first that college staff members are no different from other adults and, as such, they go through developmental stages just as other people do! Gaff (1975) has noted that sensitivity to these adult developmental stages helps point up the fact that staff members, because they are at different points in their professional and personal development, will need and want different things from a staff development program. New faculty members will probably need help in developing their approaches to instruction. Their more experienced colleagues may wish to develop skills to deal with specific problem areas.

A discussion of the adult developmental stages is an excellent way to begin the process in which staff members identify their professional and personal needs. One college reported that it has done precisely that. After

---

*The research on adult stages is also of great significance, too, with reference to adult learners, who are becoming an increasingly large proportion of the students served by colleges and universities. See "Non-traditional Responses to the Needs of New Learners," by Arthur W. Chickering in The Quality Revolution: Learner Centered Reform in Higher Education, The Institute for Undergraduate Curricular Reform and the Charlotte Area Educational Consortium, Belmont, North Carolina, 1975.

the SREB workshop, the team scheduled a full day for discussion of staff development with the entire staff of the college. The program began with a presentation by a psychology teacher on adult developmental stages. Discussion of the research findings continued throughout the day and, in fact, formed a continuous thread in the ensuing discussion of staff development needs.

It should be noted, of course, that the three components of development--instructional, organizational and personal--are not nearly so discrete as might be inferred from the two models described here. Many activities in instructional development, for example, will contain elements of the other two. The emphasis on any one component will vary with the needs of the institution at any given time.

Most institutions, no doubt, will concentrate most of their attention and resources in the instructional area, and this is entirely appropriate. Nevertheless, those who plan and implement the program need to be familiar with all three components. Concentration on any one component, to the exclusion of the others, will inhibit substantially the impact the program has on the institution.

Comprehensive Staff Development?

It was noted earlier that staff development in the past has focused only on the instructional staff, but that the trend now, at least in many two-year colleges, is to make the program more comprehensive. In this approach, all groups on the campus are included--faculty, administrators, student services personnel, secretaries, security and custodial staff.

But even though this approach is widely hailed, it is by no means fully accepted by all. In fact, the workshop participants discussed at length the advantages and disadvantages of such a comprehensive program.

One of the arguments for the narrower approach is that the faculty is the heart of the institution and performs its central mission: teaching. That being the case, the funds that are available for development should be limited to the faculty, particularly in a time of declining resources for postsecondary institutions.

Second, while development activities for all staff may sound good on paper, it is not realistic to expect groups of such wide-ranging functions, backgrounds and interests to participate in a program of staff development.

On the other side of the argument are several points. It was stated earlier that the phrase "staff development" may suggest a process of remedying weaknesses. If staff development focuses on one group, such as the faculty, and excludes others, such as the administrators, the program has the appearance of the former group needing to continue to develop while the latter does not--hardly a defensible position. While it is true that the faculty has the most direct impact on the student, other contacts are also important. For example, financial aid officers, business managers, and career guidance counselors, to name just a few, are persons whose actions can have a very profound impact on students. Further, staff members such as security officers, secretaries and others are "front line" personnel, interact directly with students (often more so than professional personnel) and have substantial impact on the effectiveness

and tone of the institution.

Crucial--but often overlooked--is the entire question of the role of work in this society, a question that is receiving more and more attention recently.* The traditional view in this culture is that a person works simply to meet his economic needs. But there is an increasing realization that work serves other functions as well. All persons, no matter what their age or occupation, have developmental needs and many of these needs, such as the need for growth, challenge, autonomy and creativity, are often met through a person's vocation.

There are some signs that society is moving to a greater understanding of work having this kind of enlarged place in people's lives, and it may well be that employers--in industry, government, and other areas--will modify their structures and practices to facilitate fulfillment of these other needs. A major means for employers to do this is through programs of staff development. Educational institutions can contribute much of this through the kinds of comprehensive staff development programs described here.

As attractive as the idea of comprehensive staff development is, however, there are some colleges which, with good reason, will not want to take this approach. One college, for example, is designing a program which will not include all subgroups on the campus because some of the persons who direct

---

*See, for example, Willard Wirtz, The Boundless Resource: A Prospectus for an Education Work-Policy (Washington, D.C.: The New Republic Book Company, Inc., 1975), and E. F. Schumacher, Small is Beautiful: Economics as if People Mattered (New York: Harper and Row, 1973).

non-instructional areas are not fully accepting of the idea of a comprehensive approach. Hence, only the instructional staff will be involved in staff development at the outset. The plan is to have some successes in the instructional area, thereby demonstrating the efficacy of staff development, and then to begin persuading other leaders and groups to become involved.

The approach of this college points up the fact that there is not one model of staff development that is appropriate for all colleges. But it is important that the approach, whether comprehensive or for faculty only, be based upon a thorough understanding of what staff development is, where the institution is in its evolution, and what the needs of the college are.

Staff Development for Part-time Personnel

If one had to identify an area of glaring weakness in staff development programs, it might well be that provided for part-time personnel. These staff persons are invariably out of the mainstream of campus faculty life and they often have only the most tenuous connection to the college. This is regrettable because in many colleges the part-time faculty make up an increasingly large proportion of the staff. Further, they bring special strengths to the college, such as a sense of realism about the world outside academe.

The problems of getting part-time faculty into staff development programs are very real. These people usually work at the college only in the evenings; they often are unable to attend regular faculty meetings; and, because of their other obligations, they cannot realistically be expected

to be available for sessions convenient to most full-time faculty.

How, then, is the staff development program to serve them? The first step is to be sure that the program has a true commitment to serving part-time as well as full-time faculty members. They should be told that there is a staff development program available in which they are strongly encouraged to participate. (It is surprising how often part-time faculty are not even invited to staff development functions.)

However, the part-time faculty should not be treated as a monolithic group. Some part-time personnel will perform exceedingly well and some of the staff development activities will not be important for them. Others will need a great deal of assistance and support and the staff development program should be designed so as to meet their needs.

Staff development activities should be provided so that part-time personnel can actually participate. For example, multiple sessions should be conducted, where possible, so that all can attend at a time convenient for them.

A staff development facility should be available for part-time faculty, complete with curriculum guides, audio-visual materials, and catalogs of illustrated materials, and a staff member should be on hand who can assist those coming to the center for help.

Needs Assessment

One of the most frequently asked questions in discussions of staff development is, "What staff development activities should we have?" Actually, the more important question that needs to be answered is, "What are our needs?"

The design of specific program activities then flows from an analysis of the needs.

One very useful approach to identifying needs, suggested by Dr. Zion at the workshop, is to develop an instrument which identifies not the weaknesses of staff members but, rather, the strengths of each individual. Such an approach has several advantages. Assessing strengths is a far, far more positive approach than identifying weaknesses. It gives the staff development program a positive tone which coincides with the redefining of "development" and gets away from the idea of correcting deficiencies.

It brings into focus the areas of need, and the staff development program can concentrate there. Further, when the "strength profiles" are completed, it is easy to see what new strengths are needed in the organization. This information can become the criteria for hiring new staff members.

Surveys of staff opinions and perceptions are a frequently used and valuable tool. A college can create its own survey instrument, but this can be facilitated by drawing upon the many instruments that other colleges are using already.

Dr. Zion discussed the characteristics of survey instruments. To be valuable, instruments need to contain a listing of possible needs people might have, goals of the staff development program, as well as formats and procedures--including such practical imformation as to whether the respondents wish to have a particular activity on the campus or elsewhere, and the time and days which are most convenient. Respondents could be asked to indicate not only how important they perceive an item to be, but also how desirable it is for the present year, the second or third year, and in

the long-range future. "This is particularly valuable," stated Dr. Zion, "because when people begin planning staff development, they tend to want to do everything in the first year." In fact, staff development is a continuous process throughout the life of the institution. Certain activities, of necessity, must precede others, while additional ones can be designed to meet the long-range goals.

But even though a written questionnaire is useful and economical (in terms of time and money), there are many needs which, to be identified, require probing, interaction, and extended discussion. These things can be done by use of techniques, such as personal interviews, small group discussions (e.g., departmental meetings), informal conversation with staff members, and use of outside consultants.

There is a further difficulty with the written questionnaire, as it relates to identification of needs of some of the non-professional staff. In one college which was preparing a questionnaire for all personnel, the director of buildings and grounds pointed out that some of the grounds staff were barely able to read, and three of them spoke only Spanish. Hence, the written questionnaire in this case was hardly applicable. The director concluded he should have only his supervisors fill out the questionnaires; he identified the laborers' needs through individual conversations with them.

Thus, it can be seen that a written questionnaire should be considered as just one of several tools to be used for identification of staff development needs.

Institutional and Personal Goals

The matter of having staff members identify their personal and professional goals brings up another important question. The institution's staff development program should be responsive to the goals and needs identified by individual staff members; but, at the same time, the program must, by definition, be in keeping with the goals of the college. Therefore, one of the first things planners need to undertake is an examination of the institution's goals, objectives and directions. Also, consideration should be given to the needs and objectives of the components of the college: divisions, departments, and other units. While these two processes are going on, the individual staff members can be determining what their own personal and professional objectives and needs are.

A good discussion of this process appears in a journal article, "Contracting for Professional Development in Academe" (Buhl and Greenfield, 1975). The article describes a situation where a division head and a faculty member sit down together to discuss the teacher's goals for the coming year. The goals he identifies include doing more work on performance evaluation of students. The division head states that more adequate evaluation is a concern of the division and the institution as well, and he tells the instructor that provisions can be made to help him reach his goals in this area. The point is that the individual and the institution have goals. For meaningful development to occur, these goals should be congruent.

Staff Development and Evaluation of Staff

What connection should there be between the staff development program and the college's system of evaluation of staff for promotion and retention? Although opinions differ on this issue, many feel there should be no connection. A staff development program is designed to meet the true needs of the staff. Staff members, it is contended, will not identify openly those needs if they know that by doing so, they may be hurting themselves when it comes time for evaluation and promotion.

An opposing opinion, however, is that the two should be integrally related. Dr. Ron McCarter, President of Southeastern Community College in Whiteville, North Carolina, who described his institution's staff development program at the workshop, believes that development is, in fact, the central reason for evaluation and, therefore, the two should not be separated. At his college the two are bound together inextricably and the system is reported to be working very well.

In fact, it is not really realistic to think the two can be fully separate, at least at the informal level. Let us suppose that a faculty member does poorly in a particular area and there are staff development activities provided to assist him and others in dealing with that concern. If he chooses not to participate, it seems logical that the person charged with evaluating him will be aware of it and this will enter into his thinking as he evaluates the instructor.

Perhaps the most sensible approach to this whole question is the one described by the dean of one college. He suggests that all the evaluator

should look at is the person's performance in his professional responsibilities, not whether he has participated in staff development activities. If he has improved in an area and is now doing well, it is this performance which counts. It does not matter whether the improvement comes about because he participates in a college-sponsored staff development activity or for some other reason. By using this approach to evaluation it can be seen that while staff development does impinge on evaluation, it is how the person carries out his responsibilities that is important; that alone should be the focus of the evaluation.

A Voluntary Program?

Traditionally, a staff development program consisted of the activities planned by an administrative leader or an *ad hoc* committee; frequently people were required to attend and participate. A new slant on staff development calls for the program to be based on identified needs of the staff and for participation to be voluntary. A program that is coercive almost invariably would be resisted by independently thinking staff members.

Assuming it is voluntary, a very difficult issue arises. If a person needs to grow and improve and knows it, that is fine. But what about the person who needs to take advantage of staff development activities and does not know he needs it?

This is a difficult question and one which may never be resolved fully. The persons who are probably most attracted to the staff development program are those who are change oriented, interested in learning and open

to new ideas. (In some ways they may be the ones who need it least!) The persons who are least interested are those who are not receptive to change or who view with skepticism a program such as this. They may remain uninvolved and even hostile to a staff development program.

Perhaps the closest one can come to a solution to this dilemma is to make the program meaningful--professionally and personally--for the participants. This is no small task, and the difficulties are abundant. But where programs are thoughtfully conceived, carefully planned and truly based upon staff members' felt needs, staff development programs are meeting with success.

The idea in having a program that is voluntary is for it to grow out of the needs of the staff, rather than from administrative dictates. But, realistically, initiative from the staff does not automatically occur. What should happen is for there to be interest and activity at the grass roots level, combined with administrative support and commitment.

To increase the voluntary participation of people, those who plan the staff development program need to build in incentives for participation. A few examples include:

1. A "mini grants" program in which faculty members prepare instructional improvement projects and receive support from the staff development committee to carry out the project.
2. Travel money for a faculty member to visit a school and learn more about a particular program.
3. Sabbaticals
4. Released time to attend an in-service seminar or workshop on the campus.

5. Continuing education credit or other credit for participation.

Finally, it is helpful for the staff development activity to be carried out in a relaxed, enjoyable kind of atmosphere. For example, one college hoped its staff development program would serve to increase communication between disparate groups on the campus and to boost sagging morale. A series of seminars was conducted in different faculty members' homes, thus adding an informal tone to the program (incidentally, such an approach cuts costs as well).

An issue that is related to the question of persons being free to participate or not to participate in a staff development program is collective bargaining. In colleges where faculty and staff become unionized, very careful attention must be given to how collective bargaining will impinge upon the staff development program.

This is, for the most part, an uncharted area, especially in the South, where unionization in higher education is fairly limited at this time. But there are some very real problems associated with collective bargaining vis-a-vis staff development. For example, instructional development efforts often call for flexible teacher-student ratios, while some collective bargaining agreements specify very strict ratios. Further, agreements may detail how staff members are to spend their time. If this is done in such a way that little flexibility is left to the individual staff member, this may work against staff development activities which are based on voluntary participation.

Schafer (1976) has noted that while collective bargaining is not necessarily a negative factor for instructional development (it may even be quite beneficial), it is critically important that those concerned with staff development ensure that provisions of the collective bargaining agreement do not have a deleterious effect on the development program.

Section III

ASPECTS OF THE PLANNING PROCESS

Early Steps in Establishing a Staff Development Program

One of the problems that colleges find themselves struggling with in the early stages of their planning and organizing is, "Just where do we start?" Several steps are suggested below, but discussion is in order at this point on three of the first steps that need to be taken: (1) defining the role of the staff development committee; (2) orienting people throughout the college as to just what staff development is; and (3) taking an inventory of staff development activities that are already going on.

The Role of the Staff Development Committee

Regardless of how the program is organized, most colleges will want to have a staff development committee. Assuming that there is such a committee established and charged with planning the staff development program, the committee members must, as a first order of business, arrive at a definition of exactly what its own role is to be. The starting place depends on the committee's particular situation. When the committee is created, its roles and functions may have been fully outlined. But sometimes the charge is not fully detailed, and where this is the case, the committee must resolve several questions before it can do its job.

The following is a checklist of questions the group may need to answer:

1. Just what is the purpose of the committee? Is it to plan a program?

Is it to implement the plan?

2. Is it ad hoc or permanent? How are new members to become part of the committee?

3. Is the group an advisory body which only can make recommendations to the college dean or president or faculty? Or, can it actually make decisions itself?

4. Does the committee have a budget of its own? Just where is the line drawn on what decisions concerning money the committee can make? Perhaps it can award money for faculty mini-grants, but can it also make decisions on sabbaticals?

5. How is it to carry out its work? Is the chairman to implement the recommendations of the committee? As the chairman does his work, does he have to get specific approval at each step along the way before action can be taken?

6. Does the committee have clerical and support staff available to perform the many duties that are part of planning and implementing a program?

7. To whom is the committee responsible? the dean? the president? the faculty? another standing committee?

8. What is the committee's relationship to other persons and groups? For example, how does the chairman or committee relate to division heads and other unit directors? Division chairmen usually have some funds for staff development within their divisions. Is all staff development to be taken away from that level and placed under the direct purview of the committee? If not, is the relationship of the staff development committee chairman and the division head one of co-equals with respect to decision-making on staff development, or does one have authority over the other in this area?

Once the staff development committee understands its role, it needs to ensure that others on the staff understand it as well. This is part of the orienting and educating process.

Promoting Widespread Understanding of Staff Development

There is a tendency for people who are establishing staff development programs to feel that the first thing they need to do is send a questionnaire

to the staff, identify needs, and organize workshops and seminars. While setting up programs rapidly is admirable, there is a process that needs to precede actual staff development activities.

The committee needs to ensure, first, that its own members have a very clear understanding of what staff development is (and is not). This can come about in such ways as having the members become thoroughly familiar with the literature on staff development, attending conferences, discussing staff development with fellow committee members, visiting other colleges with programs that are already in operation, etc. As they do this, the committee members will internalize the basic concepts of staff development and, as a result, they will be more effective in planning and implementing the program. Once the committee members have a good understanding of staff development, they need to help others on the staff--everyone from the highest level administrator to the grounds personnel--understand what staff development is.

It is this step which is frequently omitted and problems may later arise which point up this omission. The problem can be seen when a questionnaire on staff development needs is distributed prematurely, before this educating/orienting process takes place. The committee members prepare the questionnaire with their "new" view of staff development. But the respondents will fill out the questionnaire with their "old" perception of staff development. Some do not understand the new emphasis on staff development, others resent it, while others fear it. But all of this is obviated if the identification of needs is preceded by a process of helping people learn about and understand what staff development is and can be.

Various techniques can be used by staff development committees in this orienting process. One team outlined the basic concepts in a set of overlays and, using these visual aids, conducted a series of meetings in the various divisions in the college to talk about staff development. Another team met with the administrative leadership of the college and then worked with each of the administrators in leading discussions on staff development with the staff members in each administrative unit.

Another college had, in addition to its staff development committee, a group of "liaison persons," appointed by the committee. There were several people from each group on the campus (e.g., faculty, classified, etc.) who served as a link between the committee and its various constituencies. In the orienting process the committee first ensured that its own members and the liaison persons understood staff development. Then, the committee members and liaison people worked with the staff at large in orienting people to staff development. Once the program got underway, staff members were far more receptive to the program. In addition, because the liaison people were spread throughout the institution, they could "talk up" staff development in informal settings, and this served to reinforce the positive nature of the program and identify areas of misunderstanding.

With the entire process of helping people understand staff development, it must be emphatically stated that it is a task which is never completed. The staff development director or committee will never reach the point of having everyone in the college fully understand and fully support the program. Instead the process is one that goes on all the time, as a concurrent, undergirding activity of the staff development program.

Taking Inventory of Present Activities

It has been stated that staff development is not really new and that, in fact, colleges have been carrying out development activities for years. The problem is that staff development often has been sporadic and piecemeal rather than planned in a systematic way. At most colleges there is frequently no one person or office that knows precisely what is going on in staff development, for it is spread throughout the campus in various divisions, departments and other units.

Therefore, one of the first steps a newly formed staff development committee should take is to inventory everything that is going on in staff development at the college. This can be done in various ways, for example, through leaders, such as the business officer and the college deans. Once the inventory is completed, the committee can then take steps to make the ongoing activity part of the comprehensive staff development program.

Taking an inventory at the outset enables the committee to see just what is already going on in staff development, and this is a good starting point for deciding what is needed. Further, the committee gains a very meaningful psychological advantage, since the group can show that it is merely expanding or modifying a present activity, rather than initiating something completely new. In terms of strategy this is very important in minimizing resistance among staff members who look with suspicion at a new program being developed on the campus.

Funding of Staff Development Programs

There is no question that the lack of money is one of the biggest

stumbling blocks to a college operating an effective staff development program. In a time of austerity, often the first item to be slashed from the budget is staff development. It apparently is regarded as a luxury and not part of the "real" work of the school.

Such an attitude is regrettable and shortsighted, for as Bender (1974, p. 41) has noted, "faculty, administrators, and supporting personnel represent the most important capital investment of the institution." As such, money should be designated for development of the staff.

It is true that a good program cannot be carried out without a substantial amount of funding, and this needs to be faced at the outset. But often people tend to think a staff development program calls for a much greater outlay of money than is really the case. Terry O'Banion, director of the League for Innovation in Community Colleges and a leading consultant and writer in the field, suggests that most colleges can fund a staff development program. He insists that because the colleges are already spending money for such things as sabbaticals, travel, consultants, professional reading, and fall workshops, there really is money in the budget for formal, planned programs. It is just a matter of going going through the budget and determining how much money and in what ways money is already being spent on items that are, in fact, staff development.

Once it is determined how money is being spent, the budget planners should build into the program as many ways as they can to hold down costs. There are a number of procedures which can be used. First, every college

has within its staff and faculty a great deal of know-how, and the program can save money by using resident personnel as resources. For example, if some faculty members need assistance in measurement and testing perhaps there is someone in the psychology department who has the needed expertise to conduct a workshop for that group. A technician in the media center could help a welding instructor put particularly difficult parts of the course on videotape cassettes that students could use in learning those particular skills. A counselor might be able to help paraprofessionals in the career guidance center learn the skills needed to work with students.

Second, there is often a nearby university with persons on the staff who can provide the particular skills needed by the college. Further, a number of state offices for community colleges have persons on the staff who help with staff development. The office of staff development in the state system of two-year colleges in North Carolina conducts workshops for member institutions. The University of Kentucky Community College System sponsors conferences for various institutional personnel, such as business officers and division chairmen. The statewide coordinator of staff and program development in the Florida two-year college system serves as a resource for the campus directors of staff development.

Third, there are ways to ensure a high return on the money expended when staff members attend conferences. Several colleges use a technique whereby a person who attends a conference agrees to a training session for his peers on campus. A variation of this is to require the person attending the conference to prepare a written report (perhaps just a brief synthesis) of what he learned at the conference. This can then be shared

with others through publication in a staff development newsletter. By using procedures such as these, and by selecting very carefully the workshops and conferences people are to attend, there can be a high yield on the money expended.

Another useful device is to work cooperatively with other colleges in the area. For example, rather than one college paying a consultant $900 to lead a workshop, three colleges could jointly sponsor a workshop for people from all three institutions and pay only $300 per college.

Finally, a technique suggested by O'Banion relates to the college's use of its own continuing education service. He points out that two-year colleges provide courses for people throughout the community--real estate salemen, welders, management personnel.

It would make a great deal of sense, then, for the staff development program to use the college's continuing education division as a resource for college staff members. When the need for a course is identified, for example, it can be made available at the very modest fees now charged to "outside" consumers. By relying heavily on this device, a very large part of the staff development needs can be met.

Suggested Steps in Planning

The process of planning a staff development program is the most critical part of the entire effort, for, if this is not done correctly, all that comes later will suffer accordingly. Further, planning is no simple matter and devising a detailed, comprehensive plan for a staff development program generally will take several months to a year.

Because staff development must be based on the circumstances unique to each institution, there is no one plan or model which can be adopted by an institution. Nevertheless, there are certain steps which every institution does need to go through in its planning of staff development. What follows is a listing of such steps, although the sequence in which they should be done is not necessarily the same as given here.

1. The core group that is to provide the leadership in formulating the program should become immersed in staff development; the members need to study, discuss, and come to understand fully the concept of staff development--what it is and is not, the issues involved, the politics, the potential benefits and the pitfalls to watch for.
2. This group needs to orient others to staff development and ensure that the faculty and staff at large have a good understanding of it. While this is an on-going process, a big push in this area is needed initially to dispel the resistance and preconceived notions about staff development.
3. The group needs to ensure that it has commitment from the leadership of the college (financial, moral, and otherwise).
4. Some attention needs to be given to assessing the climate of the organization. Is there an atmosphere of trust and openness, or do fear, rancor and suspicion prevail? If the group reflects upon this and decides there is little trust, it needs to pinpoint particular concerns and take steps to deal with them. If these problems are not faced, then the effectiveness of a

program will be inhibited substantially.

5. The core group needs to go through a process of developing the goals of the institution or studying the goals if they are already delineated. Next, the committee needs to define what the goals of the staff development committee and program are. Once these are specified, the subsequent steps and activities will come much more easily.
6. The core group needs to do some defining of issues related to itself: What are its roles and functions, and what is its authority?
7. The group should take an inventory of what the college is already doing. There is probably more going on than is generally realized, and documenting that will serve as a positive psychological factor for the group. A means should also be established whereby the core group can stay abreast of activities that are going on.
8. Staff development needs on the campus should be assessed; there are several ways to do this. One suggested technique is a strengths inventory, another is a questionnaire, and another is discussions with members of the faculty and staff--in division meetings, in informal settings, etc. An important point is that needs cannot be identified through just one means or instrument. Some needs will surface through the use of a questionnaire; others will only be identified through conversations with faculty and staff persons.

9. Along with taking an inventory of ongoing staff development activities and assessment of needs, inventory should be taken of the resources available to the staff development committee. One could start by identifying the expertise on the campus which can subsequently be used in the program. Sources of other help could include people at nearby universities, in the community, in the state office, and at professional associations such as AACJC.

10. Next comes the planning and carrying out of specific staff development activities; these will take all sorts of forms: attendance at conferences and workshops, sabbaticals, formal courses, individual projects, on-campus seminars, weekend retreats, etc.

11. The committee needs to establish a regularized process such that each year goals are reviewed, needs are identified, activities are sponsored, program effectiveness is assessed, results are fed back into the planning, and modifications of the plan are made as needed. Then the cycle may continue year after year, with improved programs built upon the experiences of the past.

A Concluding Word

Many people may view this new emphasis on staff development as simply "old wine in new bottles"--more of the same kind of thing they have seen in the past, but with new labels attached. And it is true that there is really nothing new about staff development; colleges have been carrying out

staff development activities for years. This being the case, does the present emphasis on staff development really represent anything new for two-year colleges?

We suggest it does, for while staff development itself is not new, the new emphasis does have a number of characteristics which differ markedly from those of the past. The characteristics are summarized below:

Traditional Approach	New Approach
Staff development is an ancillary activity, apart from the real work of the college.	It is a central activity of the college, inextricably related to the mission of the institution.
It is carried out at the behest of the administration; participation is mandatory.	It is organized and directed from the grass roots level; participation is voluntary.
It is episodic in nature; discontinuous.	There is continuous activity throughout the year.
Activities are those identified by the administration.	The design of the program is based upon the needs of the staff.
Only the faculty participate.	All members of the staff participate.
The focus is on the instructional area only.	The program includes instructional development, organizational development, and personal development.
The program is to correct deficiencies.	The program is considered growth oriented and is positive and developmental in nature.
Only instructional goals are considered.	All the goals of the institution are considered and care is taken to ensure there is congruence between the goals of staff development and the goals of the institution.

Staff development, at its most fundamental level, means change. If an institution is ready to accept new ideas and new ways of doing things, then staff development can have an important effect on the college.

At the same time it must be realized that staff development is not a panacea. It will not transform a poor teacher or administrator, for example, into a good one, nor will it change a poor college structure into an effective one. But staff development can help identify problem areas and provide ways to deal with them, and in so doing it can have a very significant impact on the institution. But this will only happen where the staff development program is based upon the relevant needs of the staff, where it has the support and acceptance of the leadership and the staff, and where the organization is receptive to change.

REFERENCES

Barthlow, Robert L. "Don't Overlook Classified Staff," Community and Junior College Journal, 44 (November, 1973), p. 34.

Bender, Louis W. "Governmental Activities Affecting Staff Development," pp. 41-54, in Yarrington, op. cit., 1974.

_____. The States, Communities, and Control of the Community College. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1975.

Bergquist, William H. and Phillips, Stephen P. "Components of an Effective Faculty Development Program," Journal of Higher Education, 46 (March/April, 1975). pp. 177-211.

Blake, R. R.; Moriton, J. S.; Barnes, L. B.; and Greiner, L. E. "Breakthrough in Organizational Development," Harvard Business Review, 42 (November/December, 1964) pp. 113-155.

Boyd, James E. and Schietinger, E. F. Faculty Evaluation Procedures in Southern Colleges and Universities. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1976.

Buhl, Lance C. and Greenfield, Adele, "Contracting for Professional Development in Academe." Educational Record, 56 (Spring, 1975), pp. 111-121.

Collins, Charles C. "College Environment as a Determinant in Staff Development," pp. 55-64, in Yarrington, op. cit.

Gaff, Jerry G. Toward Faculty Renewal. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1975.

Gould, R. L. "The Phases of Adult Life: A Study in Developmental Psychology," The American Journal of Psychiatry, 129 (November, 1972), pp. 521-531.

Harcleroad, Fred F. "Graduate Programs and Changing Community College Students," pp. 17-30 in Martorana et al., op. cit., 1975.

Hodgkinson, Harold L. "Adult Development: Implications for Faculty and Administrators," Educational Record, 55 (1974), pp. 263-274.

Levineson, Daniel J.; Darrow, Charlotte M.; Klein, Edward B; Levineson, Maria H.; and McKee, Draxton. "The Psychosocial Development of Men in Early Adulthood and the Mid-life Transition," Psychopathology. Edited by D. F. Richs, A. Thomas, and M. Roff, University of Minnesota Press, 1974.

Martorana, S. V.; Tooms, William; and Brenneman, David H. (Eds.) Graduate Education and Community Colleges; Cooperative Approaches to Community College Staff Development. Washington, D.C.: National Board on Graduate Education, 1975.

Monroe, Charles R. Profile of the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1972.

O'Banion, Terry. "Staff Development: A Priority on Persons," pp. 23-40, in Yarrington, op. cit., 1974.

_____. "Alternate Forms of Graduate Education for Community College Staff: A Descriptive Review," pp. 48-62, in Martorana et al., op. cit., 1975.

Petty, Gary Frank. "A Practical Look at Management Personnel Development," Community and Junior College Journal, 45 (August/September, 1974), pp. 16-18.

Richardson, Richard C., Jr.; Blocker, Clyde E.; and Bender, Louis W. Governance for the Two Year College. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.

Semas, Phillip W. "The Search for Skilled Teachers," The Chronicle of Higher Education, September 29, 1975, p. 3.

Schaffer, Dennis. "Collective Bargaining Agreement: No Instructional Development Allowed?" Faculty Development and Evaluation in Higher Education, 1 (Winter, 1976), pp. 4-6.

Sheehy, G. "Catch-30, and Other Predictable Crises of Growing Up Adult." New York Magazine, February 18, 1974, pp. 30-44.

Yarrington, Roger (Ed.) Educational Opportunities for All: New Staff for New Students: Report of the 1973 Assembly of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, 1974.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Workshop Sponsored by the
Southern Regional Education Board

Riviera Hyatt House
Atlanta, Georgia

October 29, 1975--November 1, 1975

Wednesday, October 29, 1975

4:00-6:00 pm	Registration	Riviera Hyatt House
6:00 pm	Reception	Blue Coast Lounge
7:00 pm	Dinner	Ballroom East
8:15 pm	Opening Session	Ballroom West
	Welcome	
	Introductions	
	Presentation: Adult Development and its Implications for Staff Development William R. O'Connell, Jr.	

Thursday, October 30, 1975

9:00 am	Overview of Staff Development: Panel Presentation Chuck Claxton, Moderator Ray Hawkins Al Mizell Chris Rojahn	Monaco Room
10:00 am	Coffee	Monaco Room
10:15-4:30 pm	Organizing for Staff Development Carol Zion Director of Staff and Organizational Development Miami-Dade Community College Miami, Florida	Monaco Room

10:15	What Staff Development Is and Is Not (An Organization Development Approach)	
10:45	Planning and Problem Solving: A Simulation Approach	
12:00	Lunch Break (on your own)	
1:00	Problem Solving	
2:00	Setting Priorities	
3:00	Coffee Break	
3:15	Problems in Giving and Receiving Help	
4:30 pm	Break for Dinner (on your own)	
7:30 pm	General Session Developing the College Plan William R. O'Connell, Jr. Teams begin working on their staff development plans. (Resource consultants provided throughout the workshop to work directly with the college teams.)	Monaco Room

---

Friday, October 31, 1975

9:00 am	Teams Working	
11:00 am	Instructional Development: One College's Approach Al Mizell	Monaco Room
12:15 pm	Lunch	Club Room
1:00 pm	Comprehensive Staff Development: One College's Approach W. Ron McCarter Charles E. Grigsby	Monaco Room
2:00 pm	Teams Working	
4:30 pm	Sharing of Preliminary Plans: Groups of three teams	Monaco Room
Evening	Teams free to develop own schedule	

Saturday, November 1, 1975

9:00 am	Teams Working	
10:15 am	Coffee	Monaco Room
10:30	Teams present plans to full group: Consultant Panel Reactions	Monaco Room
12:15 Adjourn		

EPILOGUE

February, 1976	Visit to each college by SREB staff person to offer assistance to college team.

STAFF DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP
FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Southern Regional Education Board

Riviera Hyatt House
Atlanta, Georgia
October 29, 1975--November 1, 1975

ROSTER

Amarillo College
Amarillo, Texas

R. Eugene Byrd
Dean, College of Arts and Sciences

Louis J. Synck
Chairman, Department of Mathematics and Engineering

Erwin J. Mooney
Chairman, Department of English

H. D. Yarbrough
Vice President for Instruction

Brunswick Junior College
Brunswick, Georgia

Maryjane Austin
Academic Dean

James Edwards
Assistant Professor of Foreign Languages

Ralph Denty
Chairman, Division of Social Science

Jerry Payne
Assistant Professor of Mathematics

Delgado College
New Orleans, Louisiana

Tom Flair
Director of Instruction

Marvin Jenkins
Director of Project IMPACT

Cecil Groves
Vice President, Campus Operations

Jacqueline S. Lothshuetz
Member, Faculty Senate;
Associate Professor of Science

Elizabethtown Community College
Elizabethtown, Kentucky

J. Robert Hill
Associate Professor

Linda N. Holbert
Associate Professor

George L. Luster
Assistant Director

James S. Owen
Director

Essex Community College
Baltimore County, Maryland

Louis S. Albert
Acting Associate Dean of the College

Richard A. Fox
Associate Professor, Business and Industrial Management

Norma Long
Associate Professor, Health, Physical Education and Recreation Division

Michael F. Meyer
Dean of the College

Guilford Technical Institute
Jamestown, North Carolina

Barbara Kazazes
Coordinator of Counseling Services

Alwayne McClure
Staff Development Officer

N. J. Owens, Jr.
Vice President for Instruction

David Walters
Audiovisuals Coordinator

John Tyler Community College
Chester, Virginia

Betsy Little
Assistant Professor of Mathematics

Garrett Mynatt
Dean of Financial and Administrative Services

Gretchen Naff
Counselor

William Wyatt
Assistant Professor of Drafting

Paris Junior College
Paris, Texas

Dwight Chaney
Instructor, Government and History and Division Chairman

Harley Davis
Instructor, Drafting Technology and Division Chairman

Paris Junior College
Paris, Texas

Bill R. Mosely
Vice President for Instructional Affairs

Bobby Walters
Dean, General Academic Program

Parkersburg Community College
Parkersburg, West Virginia

Bernie Allen
Assistant Dean of Arts and Science, and Acting Dean

Jerry Dunn
Assistant Professor and Division Head

Tom Hillyard
Dean of Students

John McGuire
Assistant Professor, Director of Ripley Center

Seminole Community College
Sanford, Florida

Wilbur Dershimer
Data Processing Instructor

Anita J. Harrow
Director of Academic Affairs

Marilyn G. Mitchell
Coordinator, Developmental Program

Joseph B. White, Jr.
Dean of Instruction

Shelby State Community College
Memphis, Tennessee

Evelyn Bond
Instructor, Speech

Arch Griffin
Associate Professor, History

Rowan Neal
Assistant Professor, Biology

Dorcas Saunders
Director, Developmental Studies

Westark Community College
Fort Smith, Arkansas

John Collins
Instructor, Data Processing and Member, Faculty Development Committee

Delece Gordon
Faculty Development Committee

Westark Community College
Fort Smith, Arkansas

Carolyn Moore
Chairman, Division of Health Occupations

James A. Shane
Academic Dean

Workshop Resource Persons

Charles E. Grigsby, Coordinator
Mathematics Department
Southeastern Community College
Whiteville, North Carolina

Raymond M. Hawkins, Director
Community College Programs
Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System
Austin, Texas

W. Ron McCarter, President
Southeastern Community College
Whiteville, North Carolina

Al P. Mizell
Associate Dean for Instructiona. Development
Howard Community College
Columbia, Maryland

Chris Rojahn
Assistant to the President
Catonsville Community College
Baltimore, Maryland

Carol Zion, Director
Staff and Organization Development
Miami-Dade Community College
Miami, Florida

SREB Staff

Charles S. Claxton
Staff Associate

W. Edmund Moomaw
Associate Project Director
Undergraduate Education Reform Project

William R. O'Connell, Jr.
Project Director
Undergraduate Education Reform Project

E. F. Schietinger
Director of Research

Althea E. Robinson
Secretary

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

SEP 3 1976

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES